arXiv:1111.2642v2 [math.CO] 26 Apr 2012

On the rank functions of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids

Yoshio SANO

National Institute of Informatics
Tokyo 101-8430, Japan
sano@nii.ac.jp

Abstract

The notion of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids was introduced by U. Faigle and S. Fujishige in 2009 as a general model for matroids and the greedy algorithm. They gave a characterization of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids by the greedy algorithm. In this note, we give a characterization of some $\mathcal{H}$-matroids by rank functions.

Keywords: Matroid, $\mathcal{H}$-Matroid, Simplicial complex, Rank function
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05B35, 90C27

1 Introduction and Main Result

The notion of matroids was introduced by H. Whitney [11] in 1935 as an abstraction of the notion of linear independence in a vector space. Matroids are exactly those structures where the greedy algorithm yields an optimum solution. Many researchers have studied and extended the theory of matroids (cf. [3, 5, 6, 9, 10]).

In 2009, U. Faigle and S. Fujishige [2] introduced the notion of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids as a general model for matroids and the greedy algorithm. They gave a characterization of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids by the greedy algorithm. In this note, we give a characterization of the rank functions of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids that are *simplicial complexes* for *any* family $\mathcal{H}$. Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let E be a finite set and let $\rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be a set function on E. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be any family of subsets of E with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, ρ is the rank function of an $\mathcal{H}$-matroid $(E, \mathcal{I})$ if and only if ρ is a normalized unit-increasing function satisfying the $\mathcal{H}$-extension property. Moreover, if ρ is a normalized unit-increasing set function on E satisfying the $\mathcal{H}$-extension* *property and* $\mathcal{I} := \{X \in 2^E \mid \rho(X) = |X|\}$, *then* $(E, \mathcal{I})$ *is an* $\mathcal{H}$*-matroid with rank function* ρ *and* $\mathcal{I}$ *is a simplicial complex.*

(E) ($\mathcal{H}$-extension property)
For $X \in 2^E$ *and* $H \in \mathcal{H}$ *with* $X \subseteq H$, *if* $\rho(X) = |X| < \rho(H)$,
then there exists $e \in H \setminus X$ *such that* $\rho(X \cup \{e\}) = \rho(X) + 1$.

This note is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some definitions and preliminaries on $\mathcal{H}$-matroids. In Section 3, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1 and an example which shows $\mathcal{H}$-matroids that are not simplicial complexes are not characterized only by their rank functions.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Constructible families and rank functions

Let E be a nonempty finite set and let 2^E denote the family of all subsets of E. For any family $\mathcal{I}$ of subsets of E, the *extreme-point operator* $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathcal{I} \to 2^E$ and the *co-extreme-point operator* $\mathrm{ex}^*_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathcal{I} \to 2^E$ associated with $\mathcal{I}$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(I) &:= \{e \in I \mid I \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}\} \quad (I \in \mathcal{I}), \\ \mathrm{ex}^*_{\mathcal{I}}(I) &:= \{e \in E \setminus I \mid I \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}\} \quad (I \in \mathcal{I}). \end{aligned}$$

For any family $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$, we denote the set of maximal elements of $\mathcal{I}$ with respect to set inclusion by $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a nonempty family of subsets of a finite set E. The family $\mathcal{I}$ is called *constructible* if it satisfies

(C) $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(I) \neq \emptyset$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. ☐

Note that (C) implies $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$. We call $I \in \mathcal{I}$ a *base* of $\mathcal{I}$ if $\mathrm{ex}^*_{\mathcal{I}}(I) = \emptyset$. Denote the family of bases of $\mathcal{I}$ by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}) := \{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid \mathrm{ex}^*_{\mathcal{I}}(I) = \emptyset\}$. By definition, it holds that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}) \supseteq \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$.

A constructible family $\mathcal{I}$ induces a *(base) rank function* $\rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ via

$$\rho(X) = \max\nolimits_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I})} |X \cap B| = \max\nolimits_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |X \cap I|.$$

The following is easily verified by definitions.

Lemma 2.1. *The rank function* ρ *of a constructible family is normalized (i.e.* $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$*) and satisfies the unit-increase property*

(UI) $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y) \leq \rho(X) + |Y \setminus X|$ *for all* $X \subseteq Y \subseteq E$. ☐

The *restriction* of $\mathcal{I}$ to a subset $A \in 2^E$ is the family $\mathcal{I}^{(A)} := \{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid I \subseteq A\}$. Note that every restriction of a constructible family is constructible.

2.2 Simplicial complexes

Definition. A family $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ is called a *simplicial complex* if $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies the following:

(SC) $X \in 2^E$, $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $X \subseteq I \Rightarrow X \in \mathcal{I}$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *If $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex, then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists an element $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$. Then, since B is not maximal in $\mathcal{I}$, there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $B \subsetneq I$. For any $e \in I \setminus B$, we have $B \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$ since $B \cup \{e\} \subseteq I$ and $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex. Therefore $e \in \mathrm{ex}^*_{\mathcal{I}}(B)$. But this is a contradiction to $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I})$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *A family $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ is a simplicial complex if and only if it satisfies*

(SC)$'$ $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(I) = I$ *for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ be a simplicial complex. Take any $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Then we have $I \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$ for any $e \in I$. Thus $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(I) = I$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ be a family satisfying $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(I) = I$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$. We show that the family $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex. Take $X \in 2^E$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $X \subseteq I$. We show that X is also in the family $\mathcal{I}$ by induction on $|I \setminus X|$. When $|I \setminus X| = 1$, we have $I \setminus X = \{e\}$ for some $e \in E$. Since $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(I) = I$, we have $X = I \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$. Next, suppose that (SC) holds for $|I \setminus X| = k (\geq 1)$. Consider when $|I \setminus X| = k + 1$. For any $e \in I \setminus X$, we have $X \cup \{e\} \subseteq I$ and $|I \setminus (X \cup \{e\})| = k$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $X \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore $X = (X \cup \{e\}) \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$ since $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}}(X \cup \{e\}) = X \cup \{e\}$. Hence $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ be a simplicial complex and $A \in 2^E$. Then, $\mathcal{I}^{(A)} \subseteq 2^A$ is also a simplicial complex.*

Proof. Take any $X \in 2^A$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}^{(A)} := \{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid I \subseteq A\}$ with $X \subseteq I$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex, $X \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $X \subseteq A$, we have $X \in \mathcal{I}^{(A)}$. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ be a simplicial complex and $X \in 2^E$. Then, $X \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\rho(X) = |X|$.*

Proof. If $X \in \mathcal{I}$, then $\rho(X) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |X \cap I| = |X|$. Take $X \in 2^E$ with $\rho(X) = |X|$. Then there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $|X \cap I| = \rho(X) = |X|$. Therefore, $X \subseteq I$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex, we have $X \in \mathcal{I}$. $\square$

2.3 $\mathcal{H}$-Matroids

Definition. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a family of subsets of E with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$. A constructible family $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ is called an *$\mathcal{H}$-independence system* if

(I) for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}^{(H)}$ such that $|I| = \rho(H)$. ☐

Definition. Let E be a finite set and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a family of subsets of E such that $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$. An *$\mathcal{H}$-matroid* is a pair $(E, \mathcal{I})$ of the set E and an $\mathcal{H}$-independence system $\mathcal{I}$ satisfying the following property:

(M) for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$, all the bases B of $\mathcal{I}^{(H)}$ have the same cardinality $|B| = \rho(H)$. ☐

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

First, we see an example which shows that $\mathcal{H}$-matroids that are not simplicial complexes are not characterized by their rank functions.

Example 3.1. Let $E = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{\emptyset, E\}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$, $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$, and $\mathcal{I}_3 = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Then $(E, \mathcal{I}_1)$, $(E, \mathcal{I}_2)$, and $(E, \mathcal{I}_3)$ are $\mathcal{H}$-matroids with the same rank function $\rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$, $\rho(\{1\}) = \rho(\{2\}) = \rho(\{3\}) = \rho(\{1, 3\}) = 1$, and $\rho(\{1, 2\}) = \rho(\{2, 3\}) = \rho(\{1, 2, 3\}) = 2$. ☐

Therefore, we cannot distinguish $\mathcal{H}$-matroids in general by their rank functions. More generally, the following holds.

Proposition 3.2. *For any constructible families $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}'$ with $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$, the rank function ρ' associated with $\mathcal{I}'$ coincides with the rank function ρ associated with $\mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. For any $X \in 2^E$, it holds that $\rho(X) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |X \cap I| = \max_{I \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})} |X \cap I| = \max_{I \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')} |X \cap I| = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}'} |X \cap I| = \rho'(X)$ since $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$. ☐

In the following, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.3. *For any constructible family, there exists a simplicial complex such that their rank functions are the same.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ be a constructible family. Define $\mathcal{I}' := \{X \in 2^E \mid X \subset I \text{ for some } I \in \mathcal{I}\}$. Then we can check that $\mathcal{I}'$ is a simplicial complex as follows. Take $X \in 2^E$ and $I' \in \mathcal{I}'$ with $X \subseteq I'$. Then there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I' \subseteq I$ by the definition of $\mathcal{I}'$. Therefore, we have $X \subseteq I \in \mathcal{I}$ and thus $X \in \mathcal{I}'$. Thus $\mathcal{I}'$ is a simplicial complex.

Next we show $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$. Take any $I_1 \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$ and suppose that $I_1 \notin \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$. Then there exists $I' \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$ such that $I_1 \subsetneq I'$. By the definition of $\mathcal{I}'$, there exists $I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I' \subseteq I_2$. Therefore $I_1 \subsetneq I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$, which contradicts $I_1 \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$. Thus $I_1 \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$, and so $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$. Now, take any $I'' \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$. Then there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I'' \subseteq I$. Let I^* be maximal one among such I. Note that $I^* \in \mathcal{I}'$ since $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$. Since $I'' \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$, we have $I'' = I^*$. Thus $I'' \in \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$, and so $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}') \subseteq \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I})$. Hence $\mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}')$.

Note that any simplicial complex is a constructible family. By Proposition 3.2, the rank functions of $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}'$ are the same. ☐

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the rank function of an $\mathcal{H}$-matroid $(E, \mathcal{I})$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex. Then ρ satisfies the $\mathcal{H}$-extension property.*

Proof. Take $X \in 2^E$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $X \subseteq H$, and suppose that $\rho(X) = |X| < \rho(H)$. By Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{I}^{(H)}$ is a simplicial complex since $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex. Note that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}^{(H)}) = \mathbf{Max}(\mathcal{I}^{(H)})$ by Lemma 2.2. By Lemma 2.5, $X \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore $X \in \mathcal{I}^{(H)}$, and X is not a base of $\mathcal{I}^{(H)}$ by (I) and (M). So there exists $B \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $X \subsetneq B \subseteq H$ and $|B| = \rho(H)$. Take any element $e \in B \setminus X \subseteq H \setminus X$. Then $X \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$ since $X \cup \{e\} \subseteq B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ is a simplicial complex. Thus it follows that $\rho(X \cup \{e\}) = |X \cup \{e\}| = |X| + 1 = \rho(X) + 1$. ☐

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be a normalized unit-increasing function satisfying the $\mathcal{H}$-extension property for some family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^E$ with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$. Put*

$$\mathcal{I}_\rho := \{X \in 2^E \mid \rho(X) = |X|\}.$$

Then $(E, \mathcal{I}_\rho)$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-matroid and $\mathcal{I}_\rho$ is a simplicial complex.

Proof. First we show that $\mathcal{I}_\rho$ is a simplicial complex. Take any $I \in \mathcal{I}_\rho \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Then we have $\rho(I) = |I|$. Since ρ is unit-increasing, we have $\rho(I \setminus \{e\}) \leq \rho(I) \leq \rho(I \setminus \{e\}) + 1$ and thus $\rho(I \setminus \{e\}) \geq \rho(I) - 1 = |I| - 1 = |I \setminus \{e\}|$. By (UI) and $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$, we also have $0 = \rho(\emptyset) \leq \rho(I \setminus \{e\}) \leq 0 + |I \setminus \{e\}|$ and thus $\rho(I \setminus \{e\}) \leq |I \setminus \{e\}|$. Therefore we have $\rho(I \setminus \{e\}) = |I \setminus \{e\}|$ and thus $I \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}_\rho$. Hence $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathcal{I}_\rho}(I) = I$ for any $I \in \mathcal{I}_\rho \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. By Lemma 2.3, $\mathcal{I}_\rho$ is a simplicial complex. Therefore, it follows from definitions that $\mathcal{I}_\rho$ satisfies (C) and (I).

Now we show that $\mathcal{I}_\rho$ satisfies (M). Take any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Suppose that there exist $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}_\rho^{(H)})$ such that $|B_1| \neq |B_2|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|B_1| < |B_2| = \rho(H)$. Note that $\rho(B_1) = |B_1|$ and

$\rho(B_2) = |B_2|$. Then, by (E), there exists $e \in H \setminus B_1$ such that $\rho(B_1 \cup \{e\}) = \rho(B_1) + 1 = |B_1| + 1 = |B_1 \cup \{e\}|$. Thus we have $B_1 \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}_\rho$ with $B_1 \cup \{e\} \subsetneq H$. But this is a contradiction to the assumption that B_1 is a base of $\mathcal{I}_\rho^{(H)}$. Thus $\mathcal{I}_\rho$ satisfies (M). Hence $(E, \mathcal{I}_\rho)$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-matroid. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It follows from Lemmas 2.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. ☐

Remark. *Strict cg-matroids* which were introduced by S. Fujishige, G. A. Koshevoy, and Y. Sano [4] in 2007 are considered as $\mathcal{H}$-matroids $(E, \mathcal{I})$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is an abstract convex geometry and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. The rank functions $\rho : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ of strict cg-matroids $(E, \mathcal{H}; \mathcal{I})$ are characterized in [7]. For more study on *cg-matroids*, see [8]. ☐

Remark. Faigle and Fujishige gave a characterization of the rank functions $\mathcal{H}$-matroids when $\mathcal{H}$ is a closure space (see [2, Theorem 5.1]). ☐

4 Directions for Further Studies

In this section, we give directions for further studies. We introduce two generalizations of the notion of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids, called *$\mathcal{H}$-supermatroids* and *$\mathcal{H}$-submodular systems*, which would be interesting for further research.

4.1 $\mathcal{H}$-Supermatroids

The notion of supermatroids was introduced by F. D. J. Dunstan, A. W. Ingleton, and D. J. A. Welsh [1] in 1972 as a common generalization of matroids and integral polymatroids. We define $\mathcal{H}$-supermatroids as a common generalization of the notions of supermatroids and $\mathcal{H}$-matroids.

Let $(\mathcal{P}, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set (poset) with the minimum element 0. For an element $x \in \mathcal{P}$, its *height* is defined to be the maximum length of a chain from 0 to x and is denoted by $h_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$. For $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$, let $[x, y] := \{z \in \mathcal{P} \mid x \leq z \leq y\}$. A subset $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be *accessible* if, for any $i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $x \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $x \leq i$ and $[x, i] = \{x, i\}$. Note that an accessible subset of a poset with 0 always contains 0. For a subset $\mathcal{I}$ of a poset $\mathcal{P}$ with 0, we define the *rank function* $\rho_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ associated with $\mathcal{I}$ by

$$\rho_{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \max\{h_{\mathcal{P}}(i) \mid i \in \mathcal{I} \cap [0, x]\} \quad (x \in \mathcal{P}).$$

Definition. Let $(\mathcal{P}, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set with the minimum element 0 and let $\{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an accessible subset of $\mathcal{P}$. The subset $\mathcal{I}$ is called an *$\mathcal{H}$-supermatroid* on $(\mathcal{P}, \leq)$ if $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies the following property.

- For any $a \in \mathcal{H}$, all the maximal elements of $\mathcal{I} \cap [0, a]$ with respect to $\leq$ have the same height in $\mathcal{P}$. $\square$

We can easily check by definitions that, if the underlying poset $(\mathcal{P}, \leq)$ of an $\mathcal{H}$-supermatroid $\mathcal{I}$ is the Boolean lattice $(2^E, \subseteq)$, then $(E, \mathcal{I})$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-matroid. We also remark that, if $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{P}$ and the accessible subset $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{P}$ (i.e. $x \leq i \in \mathcal{I}$ implies $x \in \mathcal{I}$), then an $\mathcal{H}$-supermatroid coincides with an ordinary supermatroid. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}$-supermatroids can be regarded as a common generalization of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids and supermatroids.

4.2 $\mathcal{H}$-Submodular systems

Faigle and Fujishige showed that the rank functions of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids satisfy a kind of submodularity:

Lemma 4.1 ([2, Lemma 2.1]). *Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-matroid with rank function ρ. Then for all $H_1, H_2, G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $H_1 \subseteq H_2$, one has*

$$H_1 \subseteq G_1 \cap G_2,\ H_2 \subseteq G_1 \cup G_2 \Rightarrow \rho(H_1) + \rho(H_2) \leq \rho(G_1) + \rho(G_2). \quad \square$$

From the above lemma, we define *$\mathcal{H}$-submodular system* as a common generalization of $\mathcal{H}$-matroids and submodular systems (see [3] for various topics on submodular systems).

Definition. Let E be a finite set and let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq 2^E$ be a distributive lattice (i.e. a family of subsets of E such that $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$ implies $X \cap Y, X \cup Y \in \mathcal{D}$) with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{D}$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a subfamily of $\mathcal{D}$ with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$. A function $f : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *$\mathcal{H}$-submodular* if f satisfies:

(S) $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$, $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, $H_1 \subseteq H_2$, $H_1 \subseteq X \cap Y$, $H_2 \subseteq X \cup Y$
$\Rightarrow f(H_1) + f(H_2) \leq f(X) + f(Y)$.

An *$\mathcal{H}$-submodular system* on E is the pair $(\mathcal{D}, f)$ of a distributive lattice $\mathcal{D} \subseteq 2^E$ with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{D}$ and an $\mathcal{H}$-submodular function $f : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(\emptyset) = 0$. $\square$

We show one result which reveals a relationship between $\mathcal{H}$-submodular systems (with $\mathcal{D} = 2^E$) and polymatroids. Here we recall the definition of polymatroids. A *polymatroid* is the pair (E, f) of a finite set E and a normalized monotone submodular set function $f : 2^E \to \mathbb{R}$ (i.e. f satisfies (i) $f(\emptyset) = 0$; (ii) $X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow f(X) \leq f(Y)$; (iii) $f(X) + f(Y) \geq f(X \cap Y) + f(X \cup Y)$ for $X, Y \in 2^E$).

Proposition 4.2. *Let E be a finite set and let $f : 2^E \to \mathbb{R}$ be a set function with $f(\emptyset) = 0$. Then, (E, f) be a polymatroid if and only if f is $\mathcal{H}$-submodular for any family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^E$ with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. First, we show the "only if" part. Take any $X, Y \in 2^E$. Then we have $f(X \cap Y) + f(X \cup Y) \leq f(X) + f(Y)$ by the submodularity of f. Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^E$ be any family with $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{H}$, and take any $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $H_1 \subseteq X \cap Y$ and $H_2 \subseteq X \cup Y$. Then we have $f(H_1) \leq f(X \cap Y)$ and $f(H_2) \leq f(X \cup Y)$ by the monotonicity of f. Therefore we have $f(H_1) + f(H_2) \leq f(X) + f(Y)$, and thus f is $\mathcal{H}$-submodular.

Second, we show the "if" part. Let $\mathcal{H} = 2^E$, then the $\mathcal{H}$-submodularity of f implies that f is submodular. Take any $X, Y \in 2^E$ with $X \subseteq Y$. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{\emptyset, X, E\}$. Since $X \in \mathcal{H}$, $X \subseteq Y \cap Y$, and $X \subseteq Y \cup Y$. we have $f(X) + f(X) \leq f(Y \cap Y) + f(Y \cup Y) \leq f(Y) + f(Y)$ from the $\mathcal{H}$-submodularity of f. Therefore we have $f(X) \leq f(Y)$ and thus f is monotone. Hence we conclude (E, f) is a polymatroid. □

For an $\mathcal{H}$-submodular system $(\mathcal{D}, f)$, we define polyhedra in $\mathbb{R}^E$ by $P(f) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^E \mid \forall X \in \mathcal{D} : x(X) \leq f(X)\}$ and $B(f) := \{x \in P(f) \mid x(E) = f(E)\}$. We call $P(f)$ and $B(f)$ the *$\mathcal{H}$-submodular polyhedron* and the *$\mathcal{H}$-base polyhedron*, respectively. These polyhedra would have some nice structure, and it would be worth studying these objects.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the anonymous referees for careful reading, helpful comments, and suggestions leading to improvements in the presentation of the result. The author was supported by JSPS Research Fellowships for Young Scientists.

References

[1] F. D. J. Dunstan, A. W. Ingleton, and D. J. A. Welsh: Supermatroids, *Combinatorics* (*Proc. Conf. Combinatorial Math., Math. Inst., Oxford, 1972*) (1972) 72–122.

[2] U. Faigle and S. Fujishige: A general model for matroids and the greedy algorithm, *Math. Program., Ser. A* **119** (2009) 353–369.

[3] S. Fujishige: *Submodular Functions and Optimization*, Second Edition, Annals of Discrete Mathematics **58** (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005).

[4] S. Fujishige, G. A. Koshevoy, and Y. Sano: Matroids on convex geometries (cg-matroids), *Discrete Mathematics* **307** (2007) 1936–1950.

[5] B. Korte, L. Lovász, and R. Schrader: *Greedoids*, Algorithms and Combinatorics **4** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).

[6] J. Oxley: *Matroid Theory* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992).

[7] Y. Sano: Rank functions of strict cg-matroids, *Discrete Mathematics* **308** (2008) 4734–4744.

[8] Y. Sano: Matroids on convex geometries: Subclasses, operations, and optimization, *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences* **47** (2011) 671–703.

[9] A. Schrijver: *Combinatorial Optimization. Polyhedra and Efficiency*, Algorithms and Combinatorics **24** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003).

[10] D. J. A. Welsh: *Matroid Theory* (Academic Press, London, 1976).

[11] H. Whitney: On the abstract properties of linear dependence, *American Journal of Mathematics* **57** (1935) 509–533.